

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT**

DORIS FORD, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BRANDON SIMS, ET AL.,

Defendants.

3:12-cv-67 (CSH)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

HAIGHT, Senior District Judge:

Plaintiffs bring this Complaint against seven defendants, alleging claims under state common law (Counts One through Four, Six and Seven), the federal wire fraud statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1343 (Counts Five and Eight), and Connecticut statutes (Counts Nine and Ten). However, Plaintiffs do not allege a proper basis for this Court to exercise subject-matter jurisdiction over this matter. Even when no party has questioned the Court's subject-matter jurisdiction, the Court must dismiss an action *sua sponte* when such jurisdiction is lacking. *Endicott Johnson Corp. v. Liberty Mut. Inc. Co.*, 116 F.3d 53, 58 (2d. Cir. 1997).

A federal court possesses subject-matter jurisdiction only when either: (1) the plaintiff sets forth a colorable claim arising under the federal Constitution or a federal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1331; or (2) there is complete diversity of citizenship between the plaintiff and all defendants. 28 U.S.C. § 1332 (a)(1).

Plaintiffs invoke federal-question jurisdiction by including in the Complaint two claims under the federal wire fraud statute, 18 U.S.C. § 1343, for violation of that statute and for

